

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 41 are the pending claims in the application, of which Claims 1, 14, 28, 32 and 34, are the independent claims. Claims 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 28, 29 and 34 are being amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 8 are being amended as suggested in the Office Action to address the objections raised in the Office Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 9, 11, 12, 14, 28 and 29 are being amended independent of any objection or rejection raised by the Office Action, in order to correct some minor typographical errors.

Claims 1 to 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,272,493 (Pasquali). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 recites a browser user interface, wherein a browser executes a client system coupled to a server over a network and provides a browser user interface to server resources and wherein the browser includes functionality to request pages from servers over the network and to process received pages for presentation to a browser user. The browser user interface comprises a graphical display for presenting presented portions of browser pages to the user, a user input device for accepting user input related to a page displayed in the browser, and storage for dynamic interface elements received by the browser in connection with received pages. A dynamic interface element is able to be presented and modified in response to selected user input without requiring further interaction with a server.

The problem addressed by Pasquali is much different than that addressed by the present invention of Claim 1. More particularly, Pasquali addresses the problem of retrieving content updates from a server without a user-initiated refresh operation. As is described in Pasquali, independent of user input such as a user-initiated refresh operation, the client browser, i.e., client 108, interacts with a server, i.e., server system 102, to receive content and then uses the content received from the server to update the window objects displayed by the client browser. In stark contrast, the present invention of Claim 1 responds to user input without interacting with a server, and in particular includes a dynamic interface element (or elements) able to be presented and modified in response to user input without requiring interaction with the server. Pasquali's client browser, which interacts with a server to receive content to be displayed in the client

browser's user interface, cannot be said to be the same as the browser user interface of Claim 1 which receives and stores dynamic interface elements which are able to be presented and modified in response to selected user input without requiring further interaction with a server.

In view of the above, it is clear that Pasquali fails to disclose each and every one of the elements of Claim 1, and therefore cannot serve as the basis for a proper §102 rejection, nor is the claim rendered obvious in light of Pasquali since the record is devoid of a teaching or suggestion of the missing elements. For at least the reasons discussed above, Claim 1 (and the claims that depend from Claim 1) is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 32 (and the claims that depend from Claim 32) is also believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

Claim 2, which depends from Claim 1, recites a slide sheet dynamic interface element which opens using a sliding motion on the display in response to user input. The Office Action cites element 242 of Figure 2a of Pasquali as allegedly disclosing the claimed slide sheet. However, element 242 is a portion of an open window displayed when the open window is maximized, and not displayed when the open window is minimized. An open window, or a portion of an open window for that matter, cannot be said to be the same as a slide sheet which is opened, and which opens using a sliding motion in response to user input. For at least these reasons, and the reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 1, Claim 2 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 3 to 8, which recite further elements of the slide sheet of Claim 2 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 9 and 12 recite logic of the browser user interface of Claim 1, which tracks user interface interactions with the dynamic interface elements and communicates messages to a server indicating user interactions with dynamic interface elements, the interactions tracked by browser user interface are effected independent of whether the server receives the message.

The cited portions of Pasquali, i.e., col. 17, lines 11 to 15 and col. 18, lines 12 and 13, describe a database which is created and maintained at the server, and which stores attributes of window properties used to generate the software package downloaded to the client browser to generate the browser windows at the client. This cannot be said to be the same as tracking user interface interactions with dynamic interface elements and communicating messages indicating the tracked user interface interactions, which user interface interactions are effected independent of messages communicated to the server. For at least these reasons, and the reasons discussed

with reference to Claim 1, Pasquali cannot be said to disclose each and every one of the claimed elements. Claims 9 and 12 are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 10 recites that the pages received from the server include the dynamic interface elements as well as substitute presentations for use by browsers that do not support dynamic interface elements.

The cited portion of Pasquali, i.e., col. 10, lines 46 to 48, indicates that the windowing environment described in Pasquali can be used to display content updated in response to a user-initiated refresh operation, such as a hyperlink selection made by the user. This is not the same as pages that include both dynamic interface elements as well as substitute presentations for use by browsers that do not support the dynamic interface elements.

In accordance with Claim 11, the dynamic interface elements of Claim 1 include a menu bar providing a selection hierarchy such that a user can navigate within the menu bar without requiring further interaction with the server.

The cited portions of Pasquali, i.e., col. 9, lines 56 and 57, col. 51, lines 8 to 11 and col. 4, lines 36 to 41, fail to teach, suggest or disclose the claimed menu bar. At col. 9, lines 56 and 57, Pasquali describes a set of web site controls for controlling a web site's appearance and operation. At col. 51, lines 8 to 11, Pasquali describes a function, "popMenu()", that responds to a double-click operation by generating a pop-up window. Nothing in the cited portion of Pasquali can be said to disclose a menu bar, let alone the claimed menu bar that provides a selection hierarchy, and/or a menu bar dynamic interface element with which a user can navigate within the menu bar without requiring further interaction with the server. The other portion of Pasquali cited, i.e., col. 9, lines 56 and 57, as discussed above, describes interacting with a server to obtain updates to content for display to a user without the user initiating a refresh operation. Nothing in the cited portion can be said to teach, suggest or disclose a menu bar providing a selection hierarchy such that a user can navigate within the menu bar without requiring further interaction with the server.

Claim 14 recites a browser user interface, wherein a browser executes on a client system to present the browser user interface on a graphical display to a user of the client system and accept user input from the user, and wherein the browser includes functionality to request pages from servers over a network and to process received pages for presentation to the user. The browser user interface comprises a page display for displaying elements of a received page in

accordance with browser interpretation of data from the received page, a rotation display area which comprises some or all of the display area used for the page display, and storage for a plurality of rotation display items, comprising storage for a summary and a primary presentation for each rotation display item. The browser user interface further comprising logic for displaying, by the browser, primary presentations for less than all of the plurality of rotation display items in the rotation display area, logic for displaying, by the browser, summaries for items wherein the number of summaries is greater than the number of primary presentations presented at one time, logic for highlighting, among the summaries displayed, the ones of the summaries that correspond to the primary presentations displayed in the rotation display area, and logic for rotating, the plurality of rotation display items to display primary presentations for a different subsets of the rotation display items and for updating highlighting of summaries to correspond to the different subsets of rotation display items.

Pasquali fails to teach, suggest or disclose a plurality of rotation display items, summary and primary presentations for each rotation display item, and/or a browser user interface comprising logic for displaying primary presentations for less than all of the plurality of the plurality of rotation display items in a rotation display area, logic for displaying a number of summaries that is greater than the number of primary presentations presented at one time, logic for highlighting, among the summaries displayed, the ones of the summaries that correspond to the displayed primary presentations, and logic for rotating, the plurality of rotation display items to display primary presentations for a different subsets of the rotation display items and for updating highlighting of summaries to correspond to the different subsets of rotation display items.

The Office Action relies on the three window modules, window modules 204, 208 and 242 displaying content as shown in Figure 2B, and alleges that one of the windows is a primary display and the other two are summary windows. However, nothing can be found in the description of Figure 2B and the windows shown in Figure 2B to support this position. Rather, at col. 10, lines 22 to 32, Pasquali simply refers to each of the windowing modules 203, 204 and 208 displaying unrelated content, with module displaying travel-related content, module 204 displaying dynamic news feed and module 208 displaying content in response to a hyperlink traversal by the user. At col. 3, line 10, Pasquali refers to content that consists of highlights a news story. Nothing in the description provided by Pasquali, and in particular the cited portions

of Pasquali, teaches, suggests or discloses primary and summary presentations of a rotation display item, let alone rotating a plurality of rotation display items to display primary presentations for a different subsets of the rotation display items and for updating highlighting of summaries to correspond to the different subsets of rotation display items.

In view of the foregoing and for at least the reasons discussed above, Claim 14 (and the claims that depend from Claim 14) is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 28 recites a browser user interface, wherein a browser executes on a client system to present the browser user interface on a graphical display to a user of the client system and accept user input from the user, and wherein the browser includes functionality to request pages from servers over a network and to process received pages for presentation to the user. The browser user interface comprises storage for a plurality of layer datasets for a received page, a page display layer, wherein elements of a main layer dataset of a received page are presented according to browser interpretation of data from the received page, a tool layer having elements related to an activity, logic to optionally display the tool layer over the page display layer, and logic to accept input from the user related to the activity and removing the tool layer display when complete.

Pasquali fails to teach, suggest or disclose a browser user interface wherein a page display layer of a received page is received and elements of a main layer of a received page are presented, and logic to optionally display a tool layer having elements related to an activity over a page layer, accept input from the user related to the activity and remove the tool layer display when complete.

The Office Action cites web site controls 210 shown in Figure 2A and described at col. 9, lines 56 and 57 and contends that these web site controls correspond to the claimed tool layer, and further contends that the "X" icon, shown in Figure 1D and described at col. 8, lines 43 and 44, corresponds to removing the web site controls 210. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the web site controls 210 described in Pasquali correspond to the claimed tool layer (an assumption that is in no way conceded), nothing in Pasquali indicates that the web site controls 210 are optionally displayed. Furthermore, there is nothing in Pasquali that even suggests removing the web site controls 210, let alone using an "X" icon to remove the web site controls 210.

In view of the foregoing and for at least the reasons discussed above, Claim 28 (and the claims that depend from Claim 28) is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 29 depends from Claim 28 and recites the additional element of the tool layer being semi-transparent. The Office Action cites col. 33, line 30, which consists of a comment in a source code listing which mentions the word "transparent" with reference to a "spacer graphic" that is transparent. A transparent spacer graphic cannot be said to be the same as a semi-transparent element, let alone the claimed tool layer and/or the claimed tool layer which is semi-transparent.

Claims 30 and 31, which depend from Claim 28, recite elements similar to those recited in Claims 9 and 10, respectively. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 30 and 31 are patentable over Pasquali for at least the reasons discussed with reference to Claims 10 and 12.

Claim 34 recites a method of user interaction with a browser user interface browser user interface, wherein a browser executes on a client system coupled to a server over a network and provides a browser user interface to server resources and wherein the browser includes functionality to request pages from servers over the network and to process received pages for presentation to a browser user. The browser user interface comprises requesting a page, using the browser, from a target server, receiving the requested page at the client system from the target server, wherein the received requested page comprises a plurality of layers, where at least one of the plurality of layers is a page display layer and at least one of the plurality of layers other than the page display layer is an optional display layer comprising at least one dynamic interface element corresponding to possible user input, generating a user display corresponding to the received requested page, displaying the user display and accepting user input corresponding to the user display of the received requested page, when a user input corresponding to a request for display of the optional display layer performing the steps of modifying the display to present the optional display layer comprising at least one dynamic interface element, accepting user input corresponding to the at least one dynamic interface element, recording the accepted user input, and taking an action corresponding to the recorded accepted user input, such that the dynamic interface element is able to be presented and modified in response to the user input without requiring further interaction with the target server.

Pasquali fails to teach, suggest or disclose the multiple elements of Claim 34, e.g., the claimed optional display layer presented in response to user input corresponding to a request for the display of the optional display layer, accepting user input corresponding to dynamic interface elements of the optional display layer, recording the accepting user input and taking action

corresponding to the recorded accepted user input, such that the dynamic interface element is able to be presented and modified in response to the user input without requiring further interaction with the target server.

The Office Action relies on the window modules 203, 204 and 208 of Figure 2B of Pasquali as alleging disclosing the claimed optional display layer. As discussed above, window modules 203, 204 and 208 of Figure 2B display travel-related content, dynamic news feed and content in response to a hyperlink traversal by the user, respectively. As is described in Pasquali, each of the window modules 203, 204 and 208 require interaction with a server to be updated. Nothing in Pasquali, including the window modules 203, 204 and 208 of Pasquali can be said to teach, suggest or disclose the claimed optional display layer, which comprises at least one dynamic interface element, which is able to be presented and modified in response to the user input without requiring further interaction with the target server. Nothing in Pasquali teaches, suggest or discloses an optional display layer presented in response to user input corresponding to a request for the display of the optional display layer, accepting user input corresponding to at least one dynamic interface element of the optional display layer, recording the accepting user input and taking action corresponding to the recorded accepted user input, such that the dynamic interface element is able to be presented and modified in response to the user input without requiring further interaction with the target server.

In view of the foregoing and for at least the reasons discussed above, Claim 34 (and the claims that depend from Claim 34) is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, Claims 38 to 41, which depend from Claim 34, recite additional elements, such as, to name just a few of the additional elements recited by these claims, a semi-transparent optional display layer, which elements are discussed above in connection with one or more other claims. As yet other examples of the elements recited, Claims 38 and 39 recite transmitting user input asynchronously to a server. Based on the above discussion of Pasquali and for at least the reasons presented above, Claims 38 to 41 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

For at least the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that Pasquali fails to teach, suggest or disclose one or more elements of the claims of the present application. Pasquali cannot therefore form the basis of a proper rejection under §102, and it is respectfully requested that the § 102(b) rejection be withdrawn. Furthermore, Pasquali cannot form the basis of a

\$103(a) rejection, as the record is devoid of a teaching of the missing elements or a reason to provide same.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance therefore be issued in this case. Should matters remain which the Examiner believes could be resolved in a further telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the Applicant's undersigned attorney.

In this regard, Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached by phone in California (Pacific Standard Time) at (714) 708-6500. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the below-listed address.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fee in connection with the submission of this paper, any additional fees which may be required, now or in the future, or credit any overpayment to Account No. 50-2638. Please ensure that the Attorney Docket Number is referred when charging any payments or credits for this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Carole A. Quinn
Reg. No. 39,000
Email: quinne@gtlaw.com
Phone: (714) 708-6500

Date: January 16, 2007

Customer Number 32361
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
Met Life Building
200 Park Avenue, 20th Floor
New York, New York 10166
Phone: (212) 801-9200
Fax: (212) 801-6400
NY 238263476